THE SPIRIT OF THE QUAKERS TRIED,

According to that discovery it hath made of it self in their great Prophet, and Patriarch

George Fox,

In his Book Titled, The great MYSTERY of the great WHORE, &c.

In an Epistle to the said QUAKERS, but especially to the honest hearted amongst them.

Wherein the whole Evidence (except a very few things) doth consist of matters of fact in about 50 Instances obvious to every one's eyes, who can but read English and compare one writing with another.

ALSO

The Judgement and Sentence is pronounced by GEORGE FOX himself against himself and his party in the persons of his Adversaries.

By a Lover of Truth and Men.

For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned. Matt. 12. 37.

Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee. Luc. 19. 22.

London, Printed for *Maurice Atkins*. 1672.

THE SPIRIT OF THE QUAKERS TRIED,

According to the discovery it hath made of it self in their great Prophet, & Patriarch GEORGE FOX, in his Book Titled, The great *Mystery* the great *Whore*, &c.

Beloved friends,

I Have of long time with much grief and sorrow of heart beheld and considered your persons and principles; for whilst some of you excell in many things which are in themselves good and laudable, you do by the circumstances wherein you stand, and by other practices and Doctrines render your selves very dishonourable and dangerous to Christian Religion. I am ready to acknowledge in you a great deal of Temperance and moderation in the use of meat, drink, apparel and other pleasures and ornaments; but I wish your Insobriety, pride and Arrogance in a high conceit of your selves and contempt of others, foolish boastings and braggings were not as conspicuous: you are just and punctual in bargaining; but are you free from making a prey upon your Neighbour's credit, and taking up a slander against him? You say you

have put away malice, envy and hatred: but where ſhall we find more bitterneſs, reviling and reproachful ſpeeches than in your writings and diſcourſes? You love the Brotherhood well and are kind toward them: but you diſown and condemn all, how vertuous and devout ſoever, if in theſe times of the ſhining of your light, they ſubject not themſelves to the yoke of your conduct. You talk much of Chriſt the light: but you ſeem at leaſt to deny his perſon. Your affections are much on things in Heaven within you: but not on things above, where Chriſt ſitteth on the right hand of God. You are much to be commended for your courage and patience: but highly to be diſcommended for your ſuperſtition and groſs ignorance, whereby you expoſe your ſelves in great part to thoſe labours and hardſhips you undergo. Thus I could in many particulars ſet your vices and defects againſt your vertues and attainments: but it is not my deſign at this time to take a full view of you. And indeed I have found it very fruitleſs to deal with you by way of reaſon and Scripture; for your leading men have ſo ordered the matter, that you will not give ear to the moſt demonſtrative arguments that are againſt you; and you accept of the weakeſt reaſon imaginable on your ſide. And the reaſon is evident; for whil'ſt you look upon your ſelves as lead by an infallible ſpirit, (though it be indeed nothing but the fancy of *George Fox*, or ſome other of your Teachers) you muſt needs reject the cleareſt light that God has given to men or Angels, when it oppoſes your ſentiments. And you are ready with your anſwers of *This is the wiſdom of the world*; *This is natural underſtanding that knows not the things of God*; *the knowledge from the letter or tradition*, and the like. If we will not be put off ſo, but tell you, *we by your own confeſſion have the light within as well as you, and that light tells us thus and thus contrary to what you aſſert*: O then you tell us,

alas!

alas! you have the light, but you have not been obedient to it; you are not come to plain language; you are still in the customes of the world, respect of persons, &c. and therefore you are not to be heeded. Thus you prove your selves to be in the truth, and us to be in errour, not by divine reason and holy Scripture, but by the high opinion you have of your selves, and your low opinion of others.

I will not therefore now deal with you so much by arguments drawn from reason or Scripture, and depending purely upon the understanding and mind; but by such arguments whose evidence depends mostly upon the outward senses. And I hope, though you will not allow us to judge whether a mental proposition be true or false, sence or nonsence; yet you will not deny us capable of determining concerning matters of fact, that are before our eyes. That is to say; if you will but allow us competent witnesses to prove that *George Fox* kill'd a man, supposing we have seen him at noon day thrust him through the heart with a sword; or, if not that, you will grant that we can read English or Greek, that is, not understand English or Greek, but know A. from B. and sound them when we find them together A B. and know that A B. is not *Co*, and the like: then upon these concessions, we will undertake to prove that *George Fox* is a false Prophet, a liar or Impostor. But if you will not allow us competent witnesses against *George Fox* either in matters of reason or sense, then we beg but this favour of you that you will please to believe your own eyes; and if you will not do that, I hope you will excuse us from ever believing any thing that you say or affirm, and from ever speaking or writing to you any more. But as for those of you that have in the simplicity of their hearts by good words and fair appearances been induced to walk in your path, (for to such chiefly do I address my self) I make no question but they will see themselves mistaken.

For

For their sincerity will oblige them to give their own consciences some satisfying account why they take *George Fox* for a true Prophet, and his Doctrine for infallible as he pretends it is: but it will be impossible for them to give themselves any such account against the evidence of their senses. As for those of you that are much affected with, and have a good share in the glory and honour which accrue unto them from this singular way of knowing all things, and being better than all other men, I may say of you as Abraham to the rich man, *neither will they be perswaded, though one rose from the dead.*

But it is time for me now to begin to make good what I have undertaken, to witt, To prove to your senses that *George Fox* (who is not only a great Patriarch, but also in highest esteem among you) is a false Prophet, liar or Impostor. And thus I go about it. If *George Fox* in matters of concernment not only to mens bodies and estates but also to their souls and eternal estates, affirm that to be true which to your own eyes is manifestly false, or that to be false which is true, then he is what I have said: But *G.F.* doth so oftener than once, twice or thrice. Again, if *G.F.* doth bely not an ordinary person, a mortal man or Prince, but God Almighty, our Lord Jesus and the Holy Ghost, then he is much more guilty. Moreover, if he deal thus not only through sloth or pride or carelesness, but also through design and purpose, then he is an Impostor with a witness. Lastly, if he doth that which he judges and condemns in others, and much more than that, then he is much more guilty of that condemnation. *Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thy self, for thou that judgest dost the same things.* Rom. 2. 1.

I suppose you will not require it of me to bring proof that *George Fox* professeth himself and is esteem'd by you

for

for a Prophet, seeing your principle doth not allow any to be of the ministery but him or her that hath an immediate revelation, or a Prophet: besides *Solomon Eccles*,* no mean man, has born so great a testimony to him, that even *John Penniman* has impeacht it of Blasphemy. And *G. Fox* himself in his Book, intituled, *The great Mystery of the great Whore*, (which I shall animadvert upon,) saith, p. 82. *How can ye be ministers of the spirit, and not the Letter, if ye be not infallible? And how can they but delude people that are not infallible*, &c? p. 72. And again, *Is it not blasphemy for you to speak, and preach* (sure there is the same reason of writing) *that which ye have not received from heaven?* Here we see we are to expect nothing from *George Fox* but what is infallible, otherwise he is a Deceiver and a Blasphemer. And that we may be confident he will not impose upon us as others do, he tells us, p. 50. of that Book, *You run into all Absurdities that give your meaning to Scriptures.* Will not this man be far from falsifying Scripture, who will not so much as give his meaning to them? We shall see that afterward.

* *In his Book called*, The Quakers Challenge, thus. *Stand up Muggleton the sorcerer, whose mouth is full of Cursing, Lies and Blasphemy; who call'st thy last Book, A looking Glass for George Fox, whose name thou art not worthy to take into thy mouth who is a Prophet indeed, and hath been faithful in the Lords business from the beginning: It was said of Christ, That he was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not: So it may be said of this true Prophet, whom John said, he was not; but thou wilt feel this Prophet one day as heavy as a millstone upon thee, and although the world know him not, yet he is known.*

But first I must shew you how severe he is in taking notice of his Adversaries misciting or defective citing of Scripture: For misciting Scripture see *p.* 7. Where he brings in his Adversary saying, *Whosoever saith, he hath no sin, deceives himself*, and he saith, *He perverteth the Scripture of John.—He wrongs Johns words, and puts* He *for* We. I know not whether this change makes any alteration in the sence; but

but it's fit we should be exact in these matters. He charges his Adversary with perverting the Scripture upon the same account, *p.* 37. and how often besides I know not. Nay, so wonderfully punctual is he in the citing of Scripture that he will not have the pronoun *Ye* expressed, where of necessity it must be understood: See *p.* 188. *And Christ did not say, destroy ye this Temple, thou perverts his words.* Methinks he is more nice than wise at this turn. Now for defective citations see *p.* 75. and 29. They are both to the same purpose. He cites the Priests saying, *And the Holy Scripture is able to make men wise unto salvation.* He answers among other things; *That ever the ministers of* Newcastle *should say, that the Scriptures are able to make men wise unto salvation, and leave out faith.* It is to be acknowledged a defective citation: but in the mean time (that I may note it by the way) neither doth the putting in of *Faith* make it full, except he add also *which is in Christ Jesus.* (See 2 *Tim.* 3. 15.) For there may be faith which is not in Christ; hence Christ saith, (*Joh.* 14. 1.) *Ye believe in God, believe also in me.* But *George* did not care for that. Again, under the head of *Scriptures corrupted by the Translators* he reckons *Rom.* 1. 19. where *In the Greek Lat. & Eng. Copies* (saith he) *it is* (*speaking of the Gentiles*) *that which is known of God is manifest in them, or made known in them, though some dare say, and do say,* among *them.* The like corruption he finds in 11 *Cor.* 2. 6. *We speak wisdom* among *them that are perfect, in the Greek* (saith he) *it is,* in *them that are perfect in the Greek.* And yet it's doubtful whether that is good English, though it is good Greek. He might have spar'd the Translators such a small fault: but indeed among about 22. places of Scripture there vindicated by this Grecian (with whom nothing is more common than false English construction, and oftentimes non-sence,) from the Translators corruption, 12 or 13 of them de-

pend

pend upon the rendring of this particle *in*. But this observation tended to the credit of their beloved Doctrine of *The light within*. Once more for the credit of right citing Scripture. In *p.* 64. he corrects his Adversary, for not speaking proper like Scripture. *And* (saith he) *there is a proof to thee that the Quakers are sent of God, who speak to thee of the Scriptures right as they are.* I hope then he will give us leave to conclude, they are not sent of God, if it be apparent they do otherwise.

And now to the trial. 1. The first Scripture which I shall pitch upon as misrecited, (in his language *perverted* and *corrupted*) shall be that in *Joh.* 1. 9. the very foundation of all his Doctrine, which he repeats to nauseating, often times Thrice, sometimes Four times in one paragraph. Thrice he has it or a great part of it in 8. lines *p.* 21. And he cites it almost as often wrong as right. The Scripture runs thus in our Translation: *That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.* In the Greek it is *coming*, (not *that cometh*) and so it may refer to *light* as well as to *man*: but *George Fox p.* 9. hath it thus: *And John said, Every man that cometh into the world is enlightned.* And *p.* 10. *which every man that cometh into the world being enlightned, that through it he might believe.* And *p.* 24. *which every man that cometh into the world is enlightned withal.* See also *p.* 11. 15. with 20 or 40 more. But now has he observed that exactness which he requires in others? may there be no difference between *lighteth* and *enlightneth*? and must every man of necessity be *enlightned*, because the light *lighteth* him? If there were no difference, yet he is faulty according to his own law, for he has changed both the phrase and the tense or time. But there is great difference in that case; for example in another word, *Rom.* 2. 4. —*not knowing that the goodness of God* leadeth *thee to repentance*: but we cannot say that impenitent hearts

of whom the Apoſtle ſpeaks, are led to repentance, for God is ſaid ſometimes to do that, which is not effected, becauſe he doth all that is fit on his part for the effecting it. So our Lord Chriſt ſaith *Matt.* 5. 15. *Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a buſhel, but on a candleſtick: and it giveth light to all that are in the houſe.* And yet if a man ſhut his eyes or have very ſore eyes he ſhall not be enlightned. See alſo *Luk.* 11. 33, and 36.

2. The next ſhall be the 7th verſe of the ſame *Joh.* 1. which he has relation to in *p.* 13. (or elſe I know not where to find it,) where he anſwers thus: *Contrary to* John's *doctrin and Chriſt's, who ſaith, The light that doth enlighten every man that cometh into the world, is the true light, that men through the light might believe*; and in *p.* 10. cited but now, *that through it he might believe*; notwithſtanding if you take the pains to read it, you will find it thus: *that all men through him might believe*; and read that and the former verſe, and you will perceive that *him* refers to *John Baptiſt* and not to the *light*, as *George Fox* would have it. So that he doth not only change the word, but brings in thereby a divers ſence of his own. See *p.* 28. and many other places.

3. The Third ſhall be that in 2 *Cor.* 4. 6. which he cites almoſt as oft as that of *Joh.* 1. 9. but ſeldom right as it is, but thus or the like: *p.* 11. Anſ. *When as* Paul *ſaid, that the light which ſhined in their hearts to give the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jeſus Chriſt.* If it be non-ſence I cannot help it. *p.* 21. he ſaith —*which was the work of the true Apoſtles to bring people to the light within, that ſhined in their hearts, to give*, &c. See *p.* 41, 59. and 20. places more to the ſame purpoſe. Only in *p.* 59. when he had cited the Scripture after his wonted falſe manner, attributing that to the *light*, which the Text attributes to *God*, he ſaith, *Mark! he ſaith, the light is that which gives the knowledge*, &c. What a ſtrange degree of confidence muſt this

man

man be arrived at, that he ſhould abuſe his Reader with falſity and bid him *Mark* it too! For the Apoſtle *Paul* has it thus: *For God who commanded the light to ſhine out of darkneſs hath ſhined in our hearts to* [*give*] *the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jeſus Chriſt.* But if he had recited it right, it would then have appeared, not only that God is the giver of light, and the light a gift, but alſo, that it is the light of knowledge, and created; for God commanded the light to ſhine out of darkneſs by creating it. See *Gen.* 1.3,4. But *George Fox* likes none of theſe Doctrines, therefore it was his Intereſt to pervert the Text. And becauſe that Text *Col.* 3.10. ſeems to have been corrupted by him upon the ſame account, that ſhall be

4. The next. *And have put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him.* So ſaith Paul; but *George Fox* (*p.* 220.) puts *them* in ſtead of *him*; and ſo the Saints muſt be the Antecedent to *Them*, whereas the new man is the Antecedent to *Him*, and ſhews that the new man is created, which *George Fox* is not willing to allow; for *p.* 10. he corrects his Adverſary for ſaying, *The light is a creature*; and I take it, he means by the *light* and the *new man* the ſame thing. However this is, the alteration is manifeſt of the words, and of the ſence by reaſon thereof.

5. The fifth Scripture ſhall be that of *Deut.* 30.14. where I complain of defect, *p.* 10. for there he makes mention indeed of the words of the 12th and 13th verſes, but in the ſame Character with his own words, but then he changes his Character, whereby he intimates that he cites the very Text, and ſaith, *But the word is nigh in thy heart, Deut.* 30. Moſes ſaith, *But the word is very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, that thou mayſt do it.* To ſay *The word is nigh thee in thy heart*, agrees pretty well with his Doctrine of the *light within*: but to ſay, *The word is in thy mouth and*

in thy heart, argues that word there ſpoken of is indeed ſuch a word as is wont to be in ones mouth, that is, a word ſpoken; and that our Author *G. F.* is not willing to acknowledge. So he ſaith, *p.* 47. *The word of faith is within, Rom.* 10. This is manifeſt, that in citing this Scripture he leaves out of the middle that which ſeems againſt him, and takes the former part and the latter part that ſeem to be on his ſide. Compare this with what he condemns in his Adverſaries. Now becauſe it follows immediately in the ſame paragraph of his Book, *p.* 10. that Text in

6. *Luke* ch. 24. *v.* 5, 6. ſhall be the ſixth Scripture wherein his prevarication appears notorious. For he brings in the Prieſt ſaying, *Chriſt was not in his Diſciples, when he ſaid, I am the light of the world.* And *G. F.* corrects him by Chriſt, who ſaith, *I in you and you in me.* Then he brings in the Prieſt ſaying, *They that will come to Juſtification muſt go to Chriſts grave without*, &c. And anſwers him by citing *Deut.* 30. as I have ſaid. And then it follows. *And the Angel ſaid unto them that went to the grave without, Why ſeek ye the living among the dead, he is riſen*; now the Angel's words run thus: *Why ſeek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is riſen.* So *G. F.* leaves out, *He is not here*, out of the middle of the citation, for that would have overthrown his opinion of Chriſt within and not without: for the Angels would not ſay truth in ſaying, *He is not here*, if he was indeed *there*, even within thoſe that ſought him.

7. The Seventh Scripture follows in the ſame paragraph. (So he has abuſed 3. Texts of Scripture in 6. lines.) For it follows, after, *He is riſen, and the Saints ſits with him in heavenly places.* (We muſt take no notice of the failure in Syntax, for that's frequent.) Now *Paul* ſaith *Eph.* 2. 6.——*and made us ſit together in heavenly* [*places*] *in Chriſt Jeſus.* Now there may be a different ſence of *ſitting with Chriſt*, and *ſitting in him*; for when an Ambaſſador from any State is honour-

honourably entertained and ſeated, the people of that State may be ſaid to be honourably entertained and to ſit in him, becauſe he repreſents them; but ſcarcely to ſit with him. But whether there be any difference or no in the phraſes, it's certain that *G. F.* chargeth the Tranſlators with corruption for putting *with* for *in*. See *p.* 373. *Jud* 14. The reciting of this Scripture in this manner is ſo frequent with him, that though he uſe it perhaps 20 times or more, yet not once (I think) as it is in Scripture. And here give me leave to complain of him, that he deals like a deceitful Chapman, that would not have his wares try'd whether they be good or no, for he hides the Touchſtone, by uſing ſome words of Scripture putting them in a different character, & ſaying, *The Scripture ſaith*, or *Chriſt ſaith*, or *the Apoſtle ſaith*, &c. but he names ſeldom the Book or Chapter, more ſeldom the verſe; (though he clamour upon his Adverſaries for Chapter and verſe,) and ſo he impoſeth upon his Reader for Scripture what is no where to be found. Theſe; as I have in ſeveral particulars made it evident before your eyes, and ſhall in many more.

8. The next ſhall be that in *Joh.* 17. 5. which he often uſeth and always abuſeth as far as I remember. Chriſt's words are theſe. *And now O Father, glorify thou me with thine own ſelf, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* But *G. F.* thus, *p.* 13. —*Chriſt who was glorifyed with the Father before the world began.* You will ſay perhaps his words and Chriſt's are the ſame in ſence: but doth God give *G. Fox* his infallible ſpirit to correct his ſon Chriſt's words? Can he ſpeak better than Chriſt, or are theſe two manners of ſpeaking ſo much the ſame that they cannot be taken in a diverſe ſence? Nay, Doth not *G. Fox* take *his* phraſe in a diverſe ſence from what Chriſt intended by *his*? For it's manifeſt that Jeſus prayed now to be glorified with the glory, wherewith he was not at this time glorified

when

when he ſpake theſe words; for who will pray for that which he enjoys? But God was glorious before the world was, and could not poſſibly want it at this time, ſo as to pray for it; therefore Jeſus intends by the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, the glory which the Father had given him in his decree before the world was; but he had it not yet in poſſeſſion. So *Paul* ſpeaks of the *grace which was given us in Chriſt Jeſus before the world began*, (2 *Tim.* 1. 9.) before they had any actual Being; which ſhould come unto them, and be brought unto them at the revelation of Jeſus Chriſt. See 1 *Pet.* 1. 10, 13. And the Evangeliſt tells us expreſly *Joh.* 7. 39.—*Jeſus was not yet glorified.* But it's evident enough that *G. F.* means by his phraſe to poſſeſs his Reader with an opinion that that which he calls Chriſt, (which is not Jeſus the Son of man) was actually glorified before the world began. And this brings to my mind another phraſe of his, which he uſeth diverſe times, 8. at leaſt, as if it were Scripture, but is ſo far from being Scripture that it will be very difficult for any man to make leſs than a groſs abſurdity of it. And therefore I can ſcarce get leave of my ſelf to refer it to any phraſe of holy Writ.

9. It runs thus *p.* 66.—*and ſo to the word Chriſt Jeſus: him by whom the world was made before it was made.* Strange! that the world ſhould be made before it was made! I would fain know of him what that world was which was made before it was made: but I deſpair of Information. But what can you or any man that has not abandon'd both his underſtanding and ſence ſay in vindication of this Prophet? Can you match this ſaying in the moſt impertinent Author, Papiſt or Proteſtant?

10. A Tenth Scripture is that of *Jude verſ.* 10. and 19. *But what they know naturally, as brute beaſts, in thoſe things they corrupt themſelves.* The 19. *v.* thus. *Theſe be they that ſeparate*

ſeparate themſelves, ſenſual, having not the ſpirit. But how doth our *George* read it? p. 2. and 196. *And the Apoſtle ſaith, What they knew who are ſeparate from the ſpirit, they knew naturally as brute beaſts, Jud.* 10. 19. Judge now whether *Jude* ſay as he ſaith! But what's the difference in ſence? *Jude* ſpeaks of notoriouſly ungodly men, who corrupted themſelves in natural things, as *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*; *G. F.* ſpeaks of all men whatſoever beſides thoſe that are inſpired: *Jude* ſaith, theſe men *ſeparate themſelves, ſenſual, having not the Spirit*; and *G.* ſaith, They are *ſeparate from the ſpirit*, and they that are ſuch, *what they know they know naturally as bruit beaſts.* But what may be the deſign in rendring it thus? you may ſee he oppoſes this Text to his Adverſary aſſerting, that *there is an infallible Judgment which may be made from the Scripture without the ſpirit:* and this Text would not ſerve his purpoſe without thus corrupting it. Beſides he cannot indure that men ſhould be ſaid to know by nature any thing that's good, therefore he takes this courſe to diſparage all ſuch knowledge. But you may remember that I am not bound to give a reaſon why he perverts a Text, I am only to ſhow you that he doth ſo.

11. Next I bring you to *Rom.* 2. 15. which he is pleaſed to cite: the paſſage is this in his Book, *p.* 11. Prieſt. "*The* "*Scripture plainly denies that conſcience can juſtify, though it* "*may condemn.* Anſw. *Which is contrary to plain Scripture,* "*where the Apoſtle ſaith,* Rom. 2. 15. *Their conſciences either* "*accuſing or excuſing?* Who would think that *G. Fox* ſhould have either ſo little wit or conſcience as to write in this manner? for the Scripture words are theſe;—*their conſcience alſo bearing witneſs, and their thoughts the mean while accuſing, or elſe excuſing one another.* The truth is, *G. Fox* was willing to have this work of *accuſing* and *excuſing* attributed to the *light*, and therefore he ſaith by and by, *And the light condemns which you call conſcience:* but becauſe it

ſerved

ſerved his turn to attribute it to conſcience, he did. Beſides, the Quakers uſed to ſay, they were out of the thoughts and the imaginations; and upon that account it was not fit for him to recite the Scripture right, ſure I am he doth it wrong.

12. Let us ſee now what he ſaith of the Apoſtle *James*, for it would be ſtrange if he ſhould ſcape without abuſe. *p.* 2. He makes the Prieſt ſay, *He that can bridle his tongue is not a perfect man.* Anſw. *Which is contrary to the Apoſtle James, who ſaith he is, and ſo thou art out of James's Doctrine.* But where *James* ſaith ſo, I am to ſeek, if he cannot produce it, he belies the Apoſtle. He ſaith indeed *Ch.* 3. 2. — *in many things we offend all. If any man offend not in word, the ſame is a perfect man, and able alſo to bridle the whole body.* It may be queſtioned whether every man that can bridle his tongue, doth alſo not offend in word. The ſame Apoſtle ſaith, *Ch.* 1. 26. *If any man among you ſeem to be religious and bridleth not his tongue but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain.* But I dare not ſay, that every one that offends in word, his religion is vain.

13. *G. Fox* anſwers his Adverſary thus: *p.* 9. *Corrected by the Apoſtle, who ſaith, he works all in us and for us.* I do not remember where the Apoſtle hath thoſe words, I doubt *G. Fox* is fallible and herein miſtaken. I'le count him ſo, till I can find them. And I muſt ſay the like of that paſſage of his *p.* 15. Prieſt. *There is nothing in man to be ſpoken to but man.* Anſw. *How then miniſtred the Apoſtle to the ſpirit?* I cannot find where the Apoſtle is ſaid to miniſter to the ſpirit.

14. The next I will note is in *p.* 9. thus: Prieſt. "*The "Quakers are deceived becauſe they ſay, Chriſt is within "them, kept down by ſomething within them.* Anſ. *Corrected "by the Apoſtle who ſaith to the Saints, Chriſt is in you the "hope of glory, and he was preſt down as a Cart with ſheaves.* It's manifeſt that *Chriſt* is the Antecedent to *He*: but where is that ſpoken of Chriſt? The Prophet *Amos* (not the Apoſtle)

Apostle) saith in the name of the Lord, *Ch.* 2. *v.* 13. *Behold, I am pressed under you, as a cart is pressed that is full of sheaves.* But it is referred to the Lord or *Jehovah* that brought them out of the land of *Egypt*, *v.* 10. and not to Christ. But our Prophet *George* will not allow the Father and the Son to be distinct, but all one, (See *p.* 99.) & therefore frequently referrs that to Christ which is spoken only of God the Father.

15. So he doth with that Text, *1 Cor.* 15. 28. which he doth us the favour to cite, Chap. and verse, and to put the words in Scripture Character too: for thus he saith, *p.* 343. **The promise is to the seed, the seed is Christ, & Christ all and in all,** 1 Cor. 15. 28. He's very unhappy both in reciting words and Texts, for the Apostle saith thus: *And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God (not Christ) may be all in all.* He could not have done a greater Injury to the Holy Spirit's words than thus to put Christ for *God*, for it makes them altogether absurd: but whither will not the love of a false opinion drive men?

16. Thus where the Scripture saith—*and the word was God*, *G. F.* saith, *p.* 350. and 61. **God is the word,** *Jo.* 1. 1. I would gladly know of you, my friends, Whether the infallible spirit that leads *G. F.* into all truth, doth not also bring things to his remembrance? if it did at the time he wrote this, then he failed through wilful disobedience; if it did not, then *G. F.* is not infallible, for here either his memory or his will fail'd him. And this he is chargeable with, though we should suppose there were no difference in the sence: but I conceive there is a difference; for though the Scripture saith, *And the word was made* [or *was*] *flesh*, yet no considerate man will say, *Flesh is the word*, neither is it in it self true.

17. It seems to proceed from the same bitter root in him, that he perverts the sence by so cutting short that Scripture,

Rom. 1. 16. saying *p.* 160.—*And immortality, not come to the light,* through the power of God which is the Gospel. And *p.* 4. *And the Apostle saith,* It [the Gospel] is the power of God; whereas the Apostle saith indeed, *I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth,* &c. which is far another thing than to say simply, The Gospel is the power of God: for what may not a man make of Scripture, if he will take to himself this kind of license? Then may we say of the like phrase, 1 *Cor.* 1. 18. The preaching of the cross is foolishness; and foolishness is the power of God: for the preaching of the cross is both.

18. And if it had not been for the confounding of the person of the Son with the Father, I see no reason why he should say, *p.* 119. his father and he is greater then all. For Christ saith, Joh. 10. 29. *My Father which gave them me* [speaking of the sheep] *is greater then all.* What would you say of your Adversary that should deal thus with your writings, as *G. Fox* deals with Holy Scriptures?

19. And he that dares thus to add and insert another person into the Text as he hath done in that now named, what marvel is it that he adds the name of a person at all adventures, whether it be right or wrong? Thus doth he *p.* 134. --and so deny Christ the Lord that bought them. He had heard (it's like) formerly that Text (2 *Pet.* 2. 1.) so render'd by some or other, and therefore it must be so; though *Peter* saith only—*denying the Lord that bought them*; which may agree as well to God the Father, as to Christ his Son.

20. The two last Scriptures we noted, we found addition in them; here we have substraction; which though it might be pardon'd in another man that appears not to have any design in it, or that condemneth not severely the like in others, yet in him it cannot. If he will quote Scripture why not as it lies plainly? especially when brevity doth not constrain

ſtrain him to do otherwiſe? Thus when he ſaith *p.* 165. *Chriſt is come*, to whom every knee muſt bow, and tongue confeſs to the glory of God; why doth he neither add the Father to the term God, nor inſert, *that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord*, as the Apoſtle doth both? for he ſaith, *And that every tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.* But how the truth of this Scripture can conſiſt with their Doctrine that ſay, the Father and the Son are all one, I cannot conceive.

21. The 21th Scripture which he hath notoriouſly and impudently added to, is that in *John*, Ch. 15. *v.* 25. which according to *John* runs thus: *But when the Comforter is come, whom I will ſend unto you from the Father*, [*even*] *the ſpirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he ſhall teſtify of me.* But according to *George* thus: *Chriſt*, ſaith he, *is in the Father, and the Father is in him, and he will ſend them the ſpirit of truth the Comforter, that proceeds from the Father and the Son.* Now that it may appear moſt evidently that he quotes this as Scripture and *Chriſt's* own words, I will produce a paſſage out of the Epiſtle to *G. Whitehead's* Divinity of Chriſt ſubſcrib'd by *G. F.* & *John Stubbs*, where he uſeth the words in the letter of Scripture, ſaying alſo, The Scripture ſaith; and challengeth his adverſaries to give him Scripture in plain words; Thus it is read.

"But we do charge *Danſon*, and his Brethren to make "this good by Scripture in plain words; — For the Scri- "pture ſaith, The Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father, & the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from them. I beſeech you friends, conſider what ſpirit lead *G. F.* when he wrote theſe words! What! Call and clamour upon his Antagoniſt for Scripture in plain words, and then pretend to give his Reader Scripture & falſify it! Can you produce an Author that ever wrote ſo inconſiderately? If this be not a plain addition to the words of Chriſt, I pray tell me

what is? *It is now* (saith *Daille* of the right use of the Fathers) *the space of some Ages past, since the Eastern Church accused the Western of having added* [Filióque, *and the Son*] *in the Article* (of the Nicene Creed) *touching the procession of the Holy Ghost.* But the Pope and his Council were never so impudent as to make that addition to the Scripture, as *G. Fox* hath done. See how upon occasion of an Inference (not asserting it to be the words of Scripture) *G. Whitehead* pronounceth the curse upon his Adversary *John Newman* (Christ ascended, *&c. p.* 21, 22.) "*J. N.* from *Rev.* 1.7. "*Those that pierced him in his body of flesh, shall see that body* "*visibly come again.* G. W.'s Answ. *These are not the words* "*of Scripture, but added; although to add or diminish be for-* "*bidden under a penalty,* Rev. 22.18,19. *Yet this mans presumption leads him to incur that.* What would *G. W.* have said to him if he had done as *G. Fox* has done? Well! there is a righteous God that judgeth the heart, and tryeth the reins, and is no respecter of persons. It's true he doth not quote the Ch. and verse; but more to blame he, for if he had, we could soon have seen his forgery, whereas now perhaps not one of a Thousand (that has read his Book) has discovered it. Or if he can tell us where those words of his are to be found in Scripture, he shall escape the Curse for addition to it, till then it lies upon him.

22. The 22th instance of his negligence and fallibility in quoting Scripture may be that place *p.* 71. of his Book, where he saith,—*and Paul declares himself* (*take* Paul's *own words*) **not of Man, nor by man, but by the will of God:** now this citation might have passed currant for Scripture though it's no where found in this form, (for all I know) but that he so confidently calls them *Paul's* own words, which is false, if they be not found together, and not only apart.

23. The 23th this, *p.* 68. speaking of the Churches or Temples wherein God is worshipped by some; saith he, Is

God

God worshipped in Temples made with hands? Is not he worshipped in the spirit and in the truth? The different letter wherein he puts it, intimates that he would have us take it for Scripture; and there are some words like his in *Joh.* 4. and *Acts* 17. but in neither of those places are either the same words or the same sence: but it's sufficient against him that there are not the same words.

24. The 24th Scripture perverted is *Joh.* 7. 38. *He that believeth on me*, (saith Christ,) as *the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water:* where *his belly* is plainly spoken of him that believeth, but *G. Fox* applies it to the light, Christ, saying *p.* 130. — *and believing in the light Christ*, out of whose belly flowed rivers of living water. The *light*, the *light* must be magnified by *G. F.* and the Scripture must be wrested to that purpose, come on it what will!

25. The 25th instance of his fallibility or deceitfulness in the use of Scripture is taken from *p.* 27. where he makes the *Priest* say, *A true Church is guilty of Injury.* G. F. Answ. *Contrary to the Scriptures, where the Apostle saith*, the Church is the pillar & ground of truth, without spot or wrinkle or blemish or any such thing. The Apostle saith indeed *Eph.* 5. 25 27—Christ *also loved the Church, and gave himself for it, — that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing.* He saith, That it *might* and *should*, not that it *is*, as our *G.* represents it.

26. So he abuseth us with a defective quotation of the 30th verse of the same *Eph.* 5. which he has both in the 11. and 12th pages in the same manner, as in divers other places. The 11 *p.* thus: *Priest. They are no Christians that doth not hold Christ absent from his Church, but Antichrists.* (By the way, I believe he wrongs his Adversaries in making them speak bad English.) Answ. *Which is contrary to the Scriptures, which say*, they are flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone, *and they are as nigh together as husband and wife.* But the Apostle

Apoſtle thus: *For we are members of his body, of his fleſh and of his bones.* If he had not left out the former clauſe, *we are members of his body*, the latter clauſe which he takes, would not ſo well have ſerved his purpoſe, and alſo have been more eaſily underſtood: for we know it's ordinary for a member of a Body, or for the head it ſelf of a Body, which is an aſſembly, (as the word *Eccleſia* (here rendered *Church*) ſignifies) to be in one Countrey, when the Body or Society is at a far diſtance in another. But this was not ſo diſcoverable in the Allegory of fleſh and bones alone.

27. The 27th place ſhall ſhow that our Author's memory (which he truſts to very much,) is either through wilfulneſs or negligence as fallible, rather more fallible than that of other men; which is a great reflection upon his infallible ſpirit. Thus *p.* 152. he ſaith, *And the Apoſtle ſaid,* **the deep things of God was revealed by the ſpirit of God.** (It's a ſmall matter with him to make the Apoſtle ſpeak bad Engliſh.) But the Apoſtle ſpeaketh neither ſo nor ſo: but —*God hath revealed them unto us by his ſpirit, for the ſpirit ſearcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God:* 1 Cor. 2. 10. And *v.* 11. the Apoſtle ſaith, *But the natural man receiveth not the things of the ſpirit of God:* but *G. Fox* thus, *p.* 39. **The natural man receiveth not the things that be of God:** he leaves out *ſpirit*, though for ought he knows, there may be a vaſt difference between the things of God, and the things of the ſpirit of God, as there is a vaſt difference between blaſphemy againſt God, which may be forgiven; and the blaſphemy againſt *the Holy Ghoſt*, which *ſhall not be forgiven unto men.* Mat. 12. 31.

28. And if *G. F.* were a man capable either of rendring or underſtanding reaſon, I would aske him, why in uſing thoſe words of Paul, *Rom.* 14. 9. he puts in the term *God* in ſtead of *Lord*; for thus he ſaith *p.* 99. — **who [Chriſt] both died, & roſe again, that he might be God both of the dead,**

and

and the living. But the Apoſtle ſaith, *For to this end Chriſt both died, and roſe, and revived that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.* So *p.* 17. Let the word of God dwell in you richly: The Apoſtle hath *Chriſt.* Col. 3. 16. But this favours of his willingneſs to have no diſtinction between God and Chriſt. For he ſaith, *p.* 142. *Chriſt is not diſtinct from the Father.*

29. And *p.* 160. by the Character he writes in, he gives us theſe words for Scripture —and ſo who is in Chriſt is a new creature; And old things paſs away. But the Apoſtle ſaith 2 *Cor.* 5. 17. *Therefore if any man be in Chriſt he is a new creature: old things are paſt away, behold, all things are become new.* The Apoſtle ſpeaks of the new creation as a thing done; *G.F.* as a thing a doing and not done; for that agreed better with his deſign in that place.

30. But we have not yet done with the 2nd Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* where *Ch.* 2. *v.* 16. the Apoſtle ſaith, *To the one* [that periſh] *we are the Savour of death unto death; and to the other* [the ſaved] *the Savour of life unto life.* But *G.F.* (I ſuppoſe as he had heard it ſometimes from ſome *Prieſt*) applies it to *the word*, thus: *For the word it ſelf is immediate, for* it is the Savour of death to the death, and of life to the life; Thus when it is for the honour of his phraſe, the word muſt be put for the Apoſtles and Preachers of it.

31. The Apoſtle *Paul* 2 Tim. 3. propheſying of the wicked ones that ſhould come in the laſt dayes, ſaith, *p.* 6. *Of this ſort are they which creeps into houſes, and lead captive ſilly women laden with ſins, led away with divers luſts, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.* But *G.F.* that he may lay load upon all thoſe Preachers that are not Quakers, ſaith of *ſuch as have got the good words*, &c. *who are* reprobates concerning the faith, which crept into houſes before the Apoſtles decreaſe; which have kept people always learning, but never able to come to the knowledge

ledge of the truth, led away with divers lusts. Now the Apostle doth not attribute to these false Teachers, (which yet were bad enough) that they kept people always learning, &c. but they led captive such as were so. He should give the Devil his due, especially when he cannot take it from him without wrong to the holy spirit in the holy Apostle.

32. And that our Prophet *G.* may seem to have some colour for disparaging the other Ministers upon the account of their humane learning, he saith *p.* 70. "So all your tools ye "have wrought withal since the Apostasy, hath been taken "out of the shops of humane learning which is earthly; "this proves ye are Apostates, and the spirits gone out into "the world. And *Luke* saith, the tongues of the *Hebrew*, "*Greek* and *Latine* was set up a top of Christ by *Pilate* who "crucified him. But where *Luke* saith so, he leaves us to ghess. I have found indeed that *Luke* saith Ch. 23.38. *And a superscription also was written over him in letters of Greek, and Latine and Hebrew*; but I could never yet find *Luke* saying, *The tongues of the Hebrew, Greek and Latine was set up a top of Christ.* This came out of *George*'s own brain, that is not over fraught with those tongues I dare warrant you: but yet he will undertake to correct the Translatours; and he never doth it with greater advantage than in the rendering of that passage of the Apostle to the

33. Colossians, *Ch.* 1. *v.* 23. which we read thus: *If ye continue in the faith grounded and setled, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven:* The use of this last clause in *G. Fox* is this: *p.* 41. *Priest.* "He dare boldly assert that the Gospel is not first made "known by the seeing within, but by hearing tidings "without, &c. *G. Fox*'s Answ. Contrary to that which "they call their original, which saith, the Gospel is preached

preached in every creature. That which is to my purpose chiefly is, that he puts *is* for *was*; that it may be accommodate to his Doctrine of the Gospel in these days and all days of the world preached within them that never heard or saw a tittle of the Gospel either by word or writing. Thus when our Lord said unto his Disciples (*Mar.* 16. 15.) *Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature*, (*in* is not there;) he bade them do that which was done already, and was always done ever since there were men in the world. And then it would have been hard for the Apostle Paul, *to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named.* Rom. 15. 20. It seems *G. F.*'s Gospel of Christ is preached, where Christ is not named. This excellent use doth *G. Fox* make of his skill in the *Orginal as they call it.* But more of that afterward.

34. But is it not pretty? that whil'st *G. F.* charges the Translators with corrupting the Scripture because they render *en to* in English and sometimes *with* or *among*, that yet himself, when they have translated it *in*, should change it into *within*; (as he chang'd it into *with*, which I observed before upon *Eph.* 2.) Thus p. 105. *Now the Scriptures cannot lead into all truth, but it testifies of that that doth so. And if* **Christ be not within people, they are reprobates:** The Apostle and the Translators say; *know you not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you except ye be reprobates?* 2 Cor. 15. 5. But *G.* thinks he may boldly add to the Scripture when he doth not alter the sence, though he reproves it very sharply in others. As if *in you* could admit of no other sence but **within you.** Let us see then whether the words of Christ will always admit that sence. *Mat.* 20. 26, 27. *But it shall not be so* within *you, but whosoever will be great* within *you, let him be your minister, and whosoever will be chief* within *you, let him be your servant.* Here if *G.* please to consult that which they call the *Greek*, he will find

it *en hymin in you*, and then we must read it as I have done. And is not that excellent sence? let the impartial judge. The like fault is *G. F.* guilty of in relation to 1 *Joh.* 2. 27. where the Apostle speaketh of *the anointing which — abideth in you:* but *G. p.* 79. *-- the Apostles brought the Saints then* **to the anointing within them:** and a little below in the same page, *no one knows the eye of the soul, but who comes to the* **light within.**

35. But that charge will not lye against him for the term **within** in *Luke* 17. 21. because he finds it in the Text: but it's rare with him to use any Text and not abuse it, therefore in stead of *The kingdom of God*, as it is in the Text, he makes it go for *the kingdom of heaven*, *p.* 64. But that's a small matter, and might be passed by, but he will not leave it so, for his Adversaries do often press him with the many Scriptures, which speak of Christ's being in Heaven, and consequently absent from the Saints on earth, as far as heaven is from earth: this Text now must be press'd for his service at this turn, and must prove that Heaven is within men: Therefore he saith *p.* 101. *And the Scriptures doth witness* **heaven within.** Is not this fair dealing, first to change the Kingdom of God into the Kingdom of heaven, and then to leave out *Kingdom* too, and put *Heaven* for the whole phrase? Who needs ever want Scripture for any thing he has a mind to say, if he may abuse the words of Christ after this manner? But if he or any of you think you can produce a Text that favours him more than this, I will recal what I have writ on this point; if not, pray take notice of the grossest forgery.

Here I might bring in his uncouth use of those words in *Isai.* 8. 20. as another Instance: but because it is not very clear, that he quotes them for the very words of *Isaiah*, I will only propose it. *Isaiah* saith, *To the law, and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there*

there is no light in them. But *G. F.* thus *p.* 75. *For Isaiah — bid them come to the law and to the testimony; and you that do not speak according to that rule, it is because you hate the light in you. Isaiah* saith, *There is no light in them.* G. saith, **you hate the light in you.** One would have thought he should have had so much respect to Scripture words, as not to have said the quite contrary to them.

36. The 36th Instance of perverting Scripture shall be that in *p.* 280. where he hath this passage; —"which "[Scriptures] saith, that the Holy Ghost moved in them that "gave forth Scriptures, which led them into all truth, and "did not say, the Holy Ghost moved in the Scriptures; but "said **The letter was dead, and did not give life.** But I am to seek for that Scripture. I find indeed the Apostle *Paul* (speaking of *Moses*'s ministration, not of the writings of the new Covenant,) saith 2 *Cor.* 3. 6. — *the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life:* but I think there is difference enough between *The letter killeth*, and *The letter is dead*; for who will fear to be killed by that which is dead? for that which kills must have some activity, life or power; that which is dead hath none: and the letter and spirit are not opposed as the one dead, the other living, but as the one killing, the other enlivening. This I say to show what a perverse sence, and how contrary to the Scripture he has brought in, by altering the words.

37. And as if he scorned to quote Scripture right, he saith *p.* 170. **And I will slay you with the sword, the words of my mouth,** *saith the Lamb*, which words I cannot find in Scripture, much less spoken by the Lamb: I find these words *Rev.* 2. 16. — *and will fight against them with the sword of my mouth:* & *Rev.* 19. 21. — *the sword — which proceeded out of his mouth:* but not the other. Here is false quotation, but I know not what bad sence; therefore it is with him a small fault, though it would be a great one in his Adversaries.

 38. But

38. But my 38th Instance will discover both his forgery and vanity sufficiently. For *p.* 98. he introduceth his Adversary charging the Quakers, *that they publickly deny the resurrection of the dead body:* to which among other things he answers; *Christ*—**is the resurrection and the life both, and thy dead body shall live with my dead body:** *this is Scripture, and they that said the resurrection was past in the days of the Apostles, overthrew the faith of some.* In the first place I would know of any man what pertinency there is in this quotation of those words that seem to be taken out of *Isai.* 26. 19. Can any man be more certain by it than he was before, of the Quakers acknowledging or denying the resurrection of the dead body? or can any man tell by it, what the Prophet *Isaiah* means by those words? which are not neither the same with *G. F's*, but thus: *Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise.* So that besides the forgery, there is the greatest vanity and lightness that I remember ever to have seen in citing of Scripture. As if he would upbraid his adversaries with their respect to Scripture, *This is Scripture!* He might as well have quoted, *Abraham begot Isaac*, and have concluded, *This is Scripture.*

39. And whence it is, except from his carelesness and heighth, I know not, that *p.* 279. he read thus in a Scripture letter: Ans. **If Christ be not in you, the body is dead**; in contradiction to the Scripture which saith (Rom. 8. 10. *And if Christ be in you the body is dead*—But if it must be imputed to the Printer, so he may be excused: but till that appear, not.

40. And if he were not delighted with adding or detracting from Scripture at his pleasure, why should he not quote Christ's words as they are, *Mat.* 5. 37. *But let your communication be yea, yea, nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil?* But *G. F.* thus, *p.* 178. *He* [Christ] *says, in all your communication* **let your yea be yea, and**

your

your nay, nay; for whatsoever is contrary is evil. Why not here as he has it afterward, whatsoever is more, is evil? except it were that he would confound his Reader, and so make him believe that the Quakers are very obedient to Christs command and perfect men, though they in their communication *call* God to witness, and assert things in the presence of God, and the like phrases, which other Christians take to be Oaths, and dare not use them in that manner: at least they are more than yea and nay, which Christ saith, cometh of evil: but *G.* only, *whatsoever is contrary is evil*; as if all that is more must needs be contrary.

41. And where to find that clause which he gives us for Scripture *p.* 250. I know not. He brings in the Priest saying, *Sin is in the Saints for their humiliation.* His Ans. *Contrary to the Scripture which saith*, Christ is their humiliation. And this he hath divers times as I remember: but I take it for Scripture of his own making.

42. There he makes Scripture, here he marr's it most egregiously. For *p.* 47. he saith; *And saith the Apostle*, God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself; where he puts is for was. (See 2 Cor. 5.) the present for the past time. For you must know that their opinion is, as one of their great Authors expresseth it, that *God was in Christ reconciling men to himself ever since the fall in all ages, both before and since Christ suffered in the outward*; and consequently the verb *was* doth not signify any thing past but what is also now present and ever will be, as it always was. By this means it may as truly be said, that *God is in* G. F. *reconciling the world to himself*, as that *God was in Jesus, reconciling*, &c. forasmuch, as Christ is (so they would) as truly and properly (perhaps equally; See *p.* 67.) in *G. F.* as he was in *Jesus*. But he has not yet done abusing this Scripture, for *p.* 250. he saith, *God can do what he will, who was in Christ recon-*

reconciling himself to the world. Is not this a large liberty that he takes, to say the quite contrary to Scripture and to his own friends? for saith that Author of theirs,—*the Scripture saith not, When we were enemies God was reconcil'd to us; but —when we were enemies we were reconciled to God.* But may not *G. F.* say what him pleaseth? for he speaks by an *infallible spirit.*

43. *p.* 100. He introduceth the Priest saying: *Nor is it an essential in-dwelling of the divine nature in Gods people,* &c.

His Answ. *Doth not the Apostle say, the divine nature the Saints was made partakers of?* But where doth any Apostle say so? *Peter* saith, 2 *Pet.* 1. 4. *Whereby are given to us exceeding great and precious promises, that by these you might be partakers of the divine nature,* he doth not say, *They were* [*was*] *made partakers of the divine nature,* but *They might be,* which may relate to the time to come after the day of Judgment, and not to the present time. However he affirms that which is false concerning the Apostle.

44. The 44th Instance shall be that in *Heb* 10. 26, 27. which he quotes thus, *p.* 339. *And he that sinneth after he hath received the truth, there remains no more sacrifice for sin, but a fearful looking for of Judgment,* Heb. 10. 27. But the Scripture saith, *For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth,* &c. where it's evident enough that the stress of this Text lies in the term *wilfully* which *G. F.* is pleased to leave quite out; for so it agrees better with his Doctrine of *perfection*; and the Scripture must be made to speak to his mind, though it be false or nonsence. To let pass other differences between him & the Text.

45. The next Instance is rather of his ignorance and idleness in the use of Scripture than of his corrupting it by misrecital; for *p.* 337. against his Adversary, that saith, that *they and the Papists and Jesuites do agree all together that the Scripture is the word of God,* &c. he saith—"the Ministers

"of

"of the word calls the Scripture a **Declaration**, as ye may "read *Luke* 1. and ye do not agree with them that set forth "the *Acts*, that called it *a Treatise*, *Acts* 1.—and ye do not "agree with *John*, *Rev.* 22 who saith, *the words*; nor with "Moses, nor God, who spake all these *words*, Exod. 20. "In the beginning was the word, and the word is God, "and the word liveth and abideth for ever: but the Scri-"pture is words, and the Scripture cannot be broken. *p.* 337. I suppose he has this distinction between *the word* and *words* above 20 times in his Book. But if he would have looked upon his Greek Testament, (wherein he pretends to such skill, that he often corrects the Translators) he might have found that that very word which they translate *Treatise*, Act. 1.1. is Λογον *Logon*, which is the same which in *Jo.* 1.1. is translated *Word*, so that that very Text which he produceth against the Scripture it's being call'd *word* is a plain Text for it: and the Translators might justly and with great reason have translated thus: *The former word have I made*, &c. and then Scripture would have been call'd in English *word*, as it is in Greek. So he saith *p.* 68. *they* [the Scripture] *are not called the written word but words*; and yet his Greek Testament (if he have one) which I much doubt) would have inform'd him that Scripture is called *the word written*, 1 *Cor.* 15.54. where the English read—*the saying that is written*; but in Greek it is ὁ λογος ὁ γεγραμμενος *ho logos ho gegrammenos*; the word written: So that his distinction that he cracks so much of is come to nothing. But we have little reason to expect that he that is so intolerably unfaithful in quoting the *English*, should any way help it by the *Greek*, which I shall show that (for all his arrogant pretences) he doth not at all understand.

46. The Apostle *Paul* 1 *Cor.* 14.31. *For ye may all prophesie one by one, that all may learn and all may be comforted.* But *G. F.*—*practice and Doctrine of the Apostles in the true Church which said*, let all speak one by one. Thus he changeth

changeth *propheſy* into *ſpeak*, as if all ſpeaking were propheſying.

47. The 47th particular ſhall be that of womens ſpeaking in the Church, which the Apoſtle diſallows in the ſame 14th *Ch.v.* 34, 35. in as plain and expreſs words as can well be ſpoken, ſaying, *Let your women keep ſilence in the Churches, for it is not permitted unto them to ſpeak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as alſo ſaith the Law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a ſhame for women to ſpeak in the Church.* Here if the Apoſtle do not command ſilence to women by ſex, in thoſe caſes wherein he allows men by ſex to ſpeak, I underſtand nothing that's written. But *G. F. p.* 386. (ſpeaking of the woman that is forbid to ſpeak in the Church) ſaith— *now the woman here hath a Husband to ask at home, and not uſurp authority over the man, but Chriſt in the male as in the female, who redeems from under the Law, and makes free from the Law, that man may ſpeak*, &c. Here we may perceive, he allows women as well as men to ſpeak in the Church, and indeed your practice ſhews that women are not in any caſe excluded from ſpeaking, where it is permitted to men. Alſo we may perceive that by the husband that is to be asked at home he means *Chriſt*. Now if we may take liberty to expound Scripture after this manner, I count it utterly impoſſible to prove any truth by Scripture: & then we may as well deny Scripture as affirm it. It will be a noſe of wax that may be turned which way we pleaſe. I do not in this particular charge *G. F.* with miſrecital of, adding or diminiſhing from Scripture words, becauſe he neither quotes the place, nor puts the words in Scripture Character, as he doth in the other inſtances: but the expoſition which he gives of it is ſo groſs and abſurd, that it may well be reckon'd among his abuſes of Scripture. Beſides it ſeems to be built upon a mis-reading of Husband for *Husbands*, becauſe Chriſt,

Christ, who is but one, is made the Husbands that must be asked at home. So one of your Authors saith, *But what husbands have widows to learn of but Christ? And was not Christ the Husband of Philips 4 daughters? And may not they that learn of their husbands speak then?*

48. The 48th Instance of his abusing Scripture shall be that great doctrine of yours of not calling men *Master*, and thus he saith, *p. 43. Priest. Why may they not be called Master?* Answ. "It is his master that teacheth him to be called "of men Master, that is gone out of the truth; but Christ "said "**Be not of men called Master**, and wo be to them "that are, *Matt.* 23. Thus for *G.* Where I observe first, that he puts in here **of men** into the Text, as he doth in 20 more places besides. But then 2dly, I do not find Christ (*Matt.* 23.) saying, wo be to them that are call'd Master; that seems to be added by *G. F.* True indeed Christ saith: *But be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren. And call no man your Father upon the earth: for one is your father, which is in Heaven. Neither be ye called Masters, for one is your Master, even Christ.* Now I will take the liberty to argue a little: because the Text seems to be so plain on your side. And first let me tell you that you your selves do restrain this Text from universally excluding all men from being called *Master*, whilst you allow your servants to call you masters, and your children to call you Fathers. If your servants may call you *our Masters* or *my master*, because you are their masters; (which exception is not in the Text:) why may not another man call you masters, because you have servants and are masters? When I call a man *master*, I do not call him so because he is my master, (perhaps he is my servant,) but because he hath a servant and is a master. Now doth Christ forbid that any man should be called master, if indeed he be a master? The Apostles, that understood Christ's precept as well as

G. F. call the *Coloſſians*, *Maſters*, Col. 4. 1. and *Fathers*, Col. 3. 21. Alſo the *Epheſians*, Eph. 6. 9, and 4. And *Stephen* a man full of faith and power ſaith to the Councel of the Jews, **Men, brethren, and Fathers.** Act. 7. 2. They were not *his* Fathers, but they were *Fathers*, and therefore he calls them ſo. And why may I not as well call him, Maſter, that is not my Maſter, as call him ſervant, that is not my ſervant? 2. Let me tell you that there are divers words in the Greek Teſtament which are by our Tranſlators render'd *Maſter*, which notwithſtanding have different meanings and acceptations. Thus we find Κύριος, Διδάσκαλος, Ραββὶ, Ἐπιστάτης, Καθηγητὴς, Δεσπότης, all render'd *Maſter*. But that which is uſed by Chriſt in this Text, *Mat.* 23. 10. is Καθηγητὴς, *Katheegeetees*, which ſignifies (as the learned tell us) *a leader of the way* or *a Guide*: but as for the word Κύριος, *Kyrios*, which the Apoſtle *Paul* uſeth, when he writes to the *Coloſſians* and *Epheſians*, and is tranſlated in Scripture ſometimes *Maſter*, ſometimes *Sir*, moſt often *Lord*, we find that the Apoſtles both ſingularly and plurally ſuffer'd themſelves to be called by it. Thus in the ſingular number the *Greeks* that came up to worſhip at the Feaſt, deſired *Philip* ſaying, *Kyrie, Sir, we would ſee Jeſus.* Joh. 12. 21. And in the plural number the Jayler came trembling, and fell down before *Paul* and *Silas*, and brought them out and ſaid, *Kyrioi, Sirs*, [or Maſters,] *what muſt I do to be ſaved?* If *Sirs* or *Maſters* had been a term offenſive to the Apoſtles, would the Jayler in this caſe have call'd them ſo? or if they had diſallowed it, would not the holy writer have intimated ſo much unto us? eſpecially conſidering that Chriſt's precept is given to his Diſciples, *Be not ye called Maſters*, whereby they ſeem to be obliged to reprove thoſe that do ſo. But the example of that good Convert *Mary Magdalene* is in this caſe beyond all exception, and proves that Holy perſons uſed to call *Maſter*, not only thoſe that were known, but ſtrangers, and that

that they broke no precept of Christ in so doing; except we will say (which I abhorr to think) that *Jesus* himself suffered her in his presence to sin without reproving her: for *she supposing him to be the Gardiner, saith unto him, Kyrie, Sir* or *Master, if you have born him hence*, &c. For in her intention, she called a stranger, and him no great person, a Gardiner, Master; and that in the presence and hearing of her Lord and Master *Jesus Christ*.

Having made it manifest to your senses by a multitude of instances, that *G. F.* is not that true prophet you take him for; but the most notorious perverter of Scripture that any of you can name unto me, I hope you will give some attendance to what I have argued upon this point; though it be somewhat more than I undertook.

49. In the next place I do not find those words in Scripture which he useth for Scripture *p.* 249. when he saith, —*God justified* [Job] and said, **Job did not sin with his mouth**: the Scripture saith, *In all this did not Job sin with his lips*: but that is far from not sinning at all with his mouth; for a man may in this case keep himself from sinning with his mouth, and in that case be guilty of sin.

50. The 50th and last instance shall be that in the latter end of his Book, wherein his Ignorance, Arrogance and Imposture do manifestly appear. Marvel not that I speak so plainly, for the matter is very plain: His Ignorance and Arrogance appear in that he pretends to understand Greek, and to correct the Translators, when he doth not understand it in the least: his Imposture, in that he labours to perswade his Reader of that which is notoriously false. Thus it is *p.* 373. under the title of

Several Scriptures corrupted by the Translators,

He saith, "1 *Cor.* 15. 31. "In our English copies it is,

"*I proteſt by your rejoycing*,&c. Now *I proteſt* is added, for "there is nothing for it in the Greek, Καθ' ὑμετέραν καυχησιν. So far *G. F.* Now that he is ignorant of the Greek tongue is manifeſt, in that he ſhould have given us that Greek which the Tranſlators render *I proteſt by your rejoycing*, that ſo it might have appeared, there was nothing for *I proteſt*: but in ſtead of that he gives us the Greek *Kath emeran apothneſco*, which ſignifies *I die dayly*. And the reaſon of his miſtake ſeems clearly to have been this: The verſe in Greek begins with thoſe words that he has ſet down, but in Engliſh it begins with *I proteſt by your rejoycing*, and he did not underſtand ſo much Greek as to diſtinguiſh the one clauſe from the other. And then the falſity will appear to any man that hath but read his Greek Grammar, and will apply it to this caſe, for that which they render *I proteſt by your rejoycing*, is in Greek νὴ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν, *ne ten humeteran caucheſin*, where the particle *ne* is rendered *I proteſt by*, for *humeteran caucheſin* is *your rejoycing*. Now my Greek Grammar (which is the common one, and Printed 1629. and made I ſuppoſe long before *G. F.* was born,) ſaith that Μὰ *ma*,& νὴ *ne* are Adverbs of ſwearing. And *Scapula's* Lexicon ſaith, νὴ is a particle of granting and affirming and with an oath. The Grammar gives for example, νὴ Δία, *ita eſt per Jovem*, *So it is by Jupiter*. Neither may any one excuſe him by ſaying, that *ne* ſignifies *by* and not *I proteſt*, for *ne* being a particle that imports ſwearing, and *by* is ſometimes uſed when there is no ſwearning, it ſeems to have been neceſſary for the Tranſlators to put in *I proteſt*, or ſome other word equivalent, or elſe they had not fully expreſſed the full Import of the Apoſtles words. But whether they have tranſlated well or ill, it's certain that *ne* is in the Text, which they have ſo tranſlated, and therefore it's falſe that there's nothing in the Text for, *I proteſt*. This puts me in mind of what he ſaith *p.* 117. — *it is no where ſaid*

that

that the Apoſtle ſwore: as if every one that ſwears muſt ſay *I ſwear by God*, or the like, or elſe he doth not ſwear: that would be a notable way to excuſe many thouſands of Oaths that are ſworn by prophane men every day. Now I would not have you think that I can produce no more Inſtances of this mans failure in quoting Scripture, for I can more, and yet I ſuppoſe I have not read above half that Book whence I have collected theſe. For in truth it's a burthen to me to read ſo many Tautologies and Repetitions, ſo much non-ſence and bad Engliſh, ſo many Contradictions and Abſurdities, *&c.* If you produce any man that has wrote a Book this 500 years, wherein you can find ſo many or half ſo many falſe quotations of Scripture as I have ſhewed you in *G. F's* Book, you will ſomewhat leſſen the wonder, and make it appear that he is not an unparallel'd perverter of Scripture, but ſtill one of the greateſt that the world ever ſaw. Surely thoſe that are ingenuous among you will bluſh when you read what I have written; for you are not concerned in him only as one of your party, but as one and the chief one of your Miniſters & leaders, and not only ſo, but as in one that was of the firſt, if not the very firſt that came forth in your ſpirit & way, one of greateſt authority among you, ſo great that ſome of you are offended to behold it; one that writes in your behalf, and profeſſes to give anſwer in this one Book to above one hundred Books and papers of your Adverſaries. So that his faults are in ſome degree imputable to you, eſpecially if being warned, you do not declare againſt them, & diſown both him & them.

Neither are theſe things that I object againſt him matters whoſe proof and evidence depend upon any curious arguments or even logical Demonſtrations, but upon the Demonſtration of ſenſe; for the Queſtion is, How readeſt thou? Doth the Scripture, God, Chriſt, the Apoſtles and divinely inſpired writers ſay thoſe words, that *G.F.* charges them with? If not, as I have ſhewed to your eyes they do

not,

not, then I have proved what I undertook, *viz.* that *G. Fox* is not only, not infallible, but a falſe prophet, a liar or Impoſtor, and that in matters which concern the moſt holy God and his Son, and the holy Apoſtles and writers. If I have prov'd alſo to your eyes, that he paſſes ſevere cenſures upon others for far leſs crimes than himſelf is guilty of in the ſame kind; then ought ye to condemn him out of his own mouth. Moreover if according to your principle, (which forbids all ſwearing,) thoſe of you that affirm falſly are to be reputed as perjured perſons, then *G. F.* is highly liable to be ſo reputed. And if ye being now called as his Peers, and as it were a numerous Jury to try and judge the cauſe of *G. F.* whether he be guilty or not guilty of thoſe crimes which I have ſet before your eyes, if ye (I ſay) ſhall not find and declare him guilty, why ſhall not you alſo be accounted for perjured perſons? The evidence is not only as clear, as that Twice two are four; (for *G. F.* has deny'd as plain a propoſition as that, namely, that twice one are not two, but all one,) but as clear as that one Egg is not two Eggs, a Horſe not a Cow, or that THE is not AND, *&c.*

And now that I have brought ſuch undeniable evidence againſt him in obvious matters of fact, I will take the boldneſs to tell you, that it's manifeſt alſo to any common underſtanding, that *F. G.* neither knows the meaning of the words he writes, nor conſiders them; to ſuch a high conceit of himſelf is he arrived. Who that either knew or car'd what he ſaid, would have given out for Scripture ſuch a plain abſurdity as that in the 9th Inſtance — **by whom the world was made, before it was made?** Suppoſe he had reference to that in *Joh.* 1. 3. —*and without him was not any thing made that was made.* Would any man but he have rendered it as he hath done? What Sottiſhneſs? what pride and folly would not you impute to another that ſhould ſo do? If he had known the meaning of the word **infallible,**

would

would he have ſaid *How can they but delude people that are not infallible?* As if there were no difference between, *To fail*, and, *To be not infallible.* Who but he would have ſaid it was *contrary to Chriſt's words, to ſay, That the Son of Mary, God-man, is abſent from his Church?* Who that knew what he ſaid, would have urged, that *Bunyan is deceived, who ſaid* he [*Chriſt*] **is diſtinct from the Saints.** *p.* 16, and *p.* 293. that *the Son is not diſtinct from the Father?* Who that knew the meaning of words would contend againſt him that ſaid, *The ſoul is not infinite in it ſelf, but a creature*, and have aſſerted that it is — *infinite it ſelf*, — *immortal and infinite.* p. 29. and *p.* 68. *Is not that* [the Soul] *of his being?* and p. 90. *Is not the ſoul without beginning coming from God*, &c. and p. 273. — *it is not horrid blaſphemy to ſay the ſoul is a part of God, for it came out of him*, &c. Who that knew what he ſaid, or whereof he affirmed would have reaſoned thus, (*p.* 325.) *If the ſeed of Iſrael be men, then by thy account the ſeed of Iſrael is the ſeed of the ſerpent, for they are men?* His Adverſary chargeth him that *he profeſſed equality with God:* and he anſwers as if he did grant that ſome do witneſs equality with God, only he did not ſay it of *G. Fox.* See *p.* 127. If he had known the ſence of the word *carnal*, would he have ſaid of the Bells, *p.* 30. *If they be not carnal, then they are ſpiritual?* Who but *G. F.* would have ſaid, It was *contrary to the Apoſtle's Doctrine* to aſſert, *The Enjoyment of immortality is not till they have put off the body?* *p.* 40. And *p.* 55. he ſaith, — *They that are not worſhipping him* [Chriſt] *in them, are worſhipping men, Devils or Angels.* But he never play's the Critick with greater glory than when he meets with the word *humane* ſpoken of Chriſts nature, for then he anſwers, *where doth the Scripture ſpeak of humane, the word humane? where is it written? tell us that we may ſearch for it. Now we do not deny that Chriſt according to the fleſh was of Abra-*

ham

ham; but not the word humane. And Christ's nature is not humane, which is earthly, for that is the first Adam. And he is so pleased with this Criticism, that he has it over and over, again & again. O learned Observation! and yet we find the word ἀνθρώπινος *anthropinos* (which all our Lexicons and Dictionaries tell us signifies in Latine *humanus*, humane,) no less than Seven times in the Epistles of the New Testament, and once (*James* 3.7.) it is joyned with φύσις *nature*, *humane nature*, and 1 Cor. 2.4. it is rendered *man's*, which indeed is the plain English of it, for *humane* is rather Latine. What is then the *humane* nature of Christ, but the *man's* nature of the man Christ Jesus? And if Christ be indeed a man, must he not of necessity have the nature of a man, or a humane nature? Behold! This man never betrays his folly more, than when he pretends most to learning. Thus you may see that your difference from others is grounded much upon words and phrases misunderstood. If *G. F.* had understood *Greek*, (as he highly pretends) or *Latine*, nay or good *English*, he would never have run into many of those absurdities he is guilty of.

Now I should conclude and leave what I have written to your serious consideration; and I doubt not but it will have a divers reception among you. For there are some among you (as I hear) that are already griev'd at *G. F.* and thinks he takes too much upon him. There are others, I perswade my self, that have so high an opinion of the Doctrine of the *Light*, your great Fundamental, and conceive they are so certain of that, and have found so much benefit thereby, that they are ready to say, Though an Angel from heaven should preach any other Doctrine than that which *G. F.* has preached and they received, they could not give ear to it. To such I say. First, that the evidence I have brought of *G. F.* his failing and falsity is as clear and full as if I had brought miracles to confirm it; for the evi-

dence

dence of miracles depends upon the certainty of our faculties and senses, and such certainty we have in this case. 2ndly, I appeal to the light in every one of you, whether he is not guilty himself, in a much higher degree, of such things as he condemnes in others. 3dly, I desire you to consider, that this principle of the *light in every man*, which you so much boast in, is the principle of all Protestants, however you have entertain'd it under new names, as that which you were not aware of before; and have extended it farther than it will reach. 1. That it is the principle of all Protestants is evident from the dissent from the Church of *Rome*; the Church of *R.* pretended to be the infallible guide of all men in matters of Religion: No, says the Protestant, Every man is to judge for himself, to be satisfied in his own mind, to try the spirits whether they be of God, to prove all things and hold fast that which is good, and not to pin his faith upon any man or Church's sleeve. And that they may so do, God has (say they) endued every man with such a light of common and certain principles written in every mans heart, that if a prophet should come and give them a sign or a wonder to draw them away from the observance of that light and those principles, they ought not to hearken to the words of that prophet (See *Deut.* 13. 1, 2, 3.) Moreover they say that God has promised his holy spirit to them that humbly implore it in the obedience of that light which God has already afforded. To this purpose they quote those words of Christ, *If any man will do his will, he shall know of the Doctrine whether it be of God*, &c. Joh. 7. 17. 2ly, That you have entertained it under new names, appears from the contention between you and others, whether God have given this light to men by nature, consequently whether it is a natural light or a divine light, &c. to which purpose your adversaries quote *Rom.* 2. 14, 15. *For when the Gentiles that have not the law do by nature the things con-*

tained in the law, these having not the law are a law unto themselves, which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another. You urge *Joh.* 1. 9. to prove it is a divine light, which Christ the true light lighteth every man withall, that cometh into the world. Is not the difference now between you and others about words and names? for whether God hath given it unto men by nature or not, it is of God in respect of it's proceeding from God and tending to him; for God is as truly the Author of the good gifts that come unto men by nature as of other gifts; and what reason can there be, why that should not be said to be natural, which agrees to every Individual of the same kind, as you say the light doth? for *G. F.* saith *p.* 20.—*a blind man and an Infant is inlightned with the light of Christ—and where there is life in an Infant there is light.* And the Apostle saith—the *Gentiles do by nature*, &c. *and—are a law to themselves.* Thus an eminent preacher in a great Assembly of late upon that Text. "And "so far the Quakers are in the right, if they understand "themselves, and mean no more by it, when they say that "every man hath a light within him, than this; That eve- "ry man hath naturally the notions of good and evil with- "in him, which in plain cases of good and evil, right and "wrong, will tell him what he ought to do, and what he "ought to avoid, by which he ought to be directed; and "that his conscience will acquit and excuse him if he do "the one, and accuse and condemn him if he do the other. Thus far he. And this helps me to shew in the 3d place, that you extend the Doctrine of the light in every man farther than you ought; for it is not to be extended to all cases whatsoever, as if every man that attends to the light in him, did certainly know what is good, what is evil, right or wrong in every case, for many cases are very difficult, and

even

even good men do commonly differ in their Judgment concerning them? So we see that among the Saints at *Rome*, to whom *Paul* wrote, *One* (saith he) *believeth that he may eat all things: another who is weak, eateth herbs. One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike.* *Rom.* 14. 2, 5. And the Apostle doth not condemn them for judging thus diversly, but teacheth them how to behave themselves under this diversity. And I appeal to the Conscience of every one of you who has not enslaved his Judgement to the Judgment of your Ministers and Elders, whether in divers cases which come before you in your Judicatories, you are not of another mind before you hear the Judgment of those your Elders, and sometimes afterward also? and whether you do verily believe that in all cases that have been decided by you, every particular person would have been of the same mind being alone, as the Society was of in their determination? Nay do you not sometimes find your selves aggrieved at the Judgment of men? and are you not forced sometimes to set up the Judgment of a part or of the Elders, against the Judgment of another part of the people? If you are; then how is the light in every one of you extended to every particular case? or is the light contrary to it self in this and that man or number of men? And where is the Infallibility you speak of in particular persons, in all cases? If you consider this well, I am perswaded you will perceive that the light in every man, (especially in those whose Judgments have been prepossessed with false notions, (as many of you have been before you were Quakers) doth not teach him all things whatsoever, but all things that are necessary for him to know in order to a holy trust in God, and sincere obedience in the general course of his life. Besides, Doth not the light in every man teach him to make use of such helps and assistances, as God has afforded him? And doth not the Apo-

ſtle *Paul* ſay — *whatſoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope?* Rom. 15.4. And the Apoſtle John — *Theſe* [*things*] *are written that ye might believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name,* Joh. 20. 31. Now ſuppoſing the light in every man would teach him every particular thing, it is always to be underſtood, if he be obedient to what he knows and diligent in the uſe of thoſe means God has afforded him, of which we find the holy Scriptures are very great means: and perhaps he has been negligent in the uſe of theſe; indeed who can think any leſs of you, who have ſuffered a Book to be ſet out in your names about 12 years agoe, wherein I have ſhewed you about fifty falſe quotations, (not only falſe Interpretations or meanings) beſides non-ſence and other faults, and yet I am apt to think, that ſcarce one in 500 of you that have read that Book, have obſerved any ſuch falſities. And muſt we believe that God will ſtill give you a light actually teaching you all things whatever, how negligent ſoever you have been or are in the following of that he hath given you? Muſt God be bound with his divine light and Inſpiration to ſupply the defects of your Idleneſs and pride? For when other men count it great mercy and favour in God, that he is pleaſed through the vileſt means that may be, and through their earneſt Study and diligence to grant them the knowledge of his will, inlightning their minds by his holy Spirit; you muſt have it, like the Angels that always behold his face, by immediate Revelation, and without labour and Induſtry.

So now my friends, I deny not that there is a light in every man, which he is obliged under pain of the diſpleaſure of the Almighty diligently to eye and follow; that ſo doing it will lead him by degrees into all neceſſary truth, and

and at length to eternal life. I deny not but some of you have received and done much good by following this light: but I must say again, and that with great sorrow of heart, that your preachers, especially *G. F.* have greatly mistaken both the Teachings of and the Obedience to the Light; that your zeal has been in great part, not according to knowledge; that you lay great snares in your own way, by binding your selves to those things, to which God hath not bound you; that in stead of worshipping God in spirit and truth, you require the observation of ceremonies, things in themselves neither *good* nor evil; such are your not putting off the hat in Salutations, not saying *you* but *thou* to a single person, not calling him Master that is a Master, and the like, which your negative precepts no man in the world is one jot the better for, & you are the worse. But above all, your allegorical way of interpreting Scripture tends utterly to make it void and of no use, and consequently to the ruine and overthrow of all Christian Religion.

Now I doubt not but there will be found among you more then one *Solomon Eccles*, whose blood will boile within him and stir him up to the vindication of this great Prophet: & I can easily perswade my self that there is scarce any one of you, that at least has at any time wrote any thing in your cause, but he or she will think him or herself as soon they read the Title-page, able to give a confuting answer to all that can be said against so worthy a person: but I should think that as none of you is so able, so none should be more provoked to defend him than your late Apologist *William Penn*, who *from Jenner's relation did observe, that the only blasphemy was against* G. Fox, *in speaking evilly of the Lord's servant.* (p.170. of that Apol.) If he be moved to ingage in it, I only beg of him that he would first be satisfied in his own conscience and light concerning that undertaking:

dertaking: and if he can do that, I ſhall ever after have a better opinion of the Popiſh writers that ingage in defence of Tranſubſtantiation.

Here I eaſily foreſee, one ſubſtantial Objection againſt me and Defence of *George* will be, that I was aſhamed of my name, and durſt not ſubſcribe it to the charge. Now I am almoſt ready to grant the laſt part of the Objection, for I have ſome fear upon me on that account, and my reaſons for it are ſuch as theſe. 1. There are ſome of your writers, that make it a great part of their anſwers to Books, the reproaching of the Authors, and they are very Rhetorical in that point, and truly I deſire rather a pertinent anſwer, and am not willing to put into your hands an occaſion for an impertinent one. If you had my name, then it muſt be conſidered what party I am of, whether an *Epiſcopalian*, *Presbyterian*, *Independent*, &c. and accordingly all that is odious or ſo reputed either in the Doctrine or practice of the whole party or any particular perſon thereof muſt all be raked up againſt me, and ſerve for a very plauſible Anſwer. Or if I ſhould chance to be an old man of ſixty ſix, like your Adverſary *Jenner*; that would help, (as it doth againſt him) to render me doting at every turn, and be matter for a good part of an eighteen pence Apology. Or if I have been a Braſier heretofore, or a Tayler, the world muſt be made to know what a pitiful mean fellow I am, and muſt be told my name with Tinker or Tayler at the end on't. [See the Apol. *p.* 2.] But if all this will not be enough, you have a way that will ſerve you effectually to diſgrace any man living, ſo far as it is in your power; and that is by ſuggeſting (as *G. Whitehead* againſt Mr. *Danſon* (*Divinity of Chriſt*, p. 49.) that he was given to Gaming, Bowls, and Nine-pins) any crime whatſoever; and when the ſuggeſtion is proved to be falſe, if it ſo fall out unhappily, you may come off as he, by ſaying, you did but *quære* whether

whether it was so or no; you did not positively affirm it. Will these things incourage any man to put his name into your hands, that can keep it out? Judge yee! Besides, I know not what disadvantage it will be to you, not to know my name, for what I have written will be as true without it as with it. I confess that perhaps you will lose some of that sweetness of Revenge you would take in lustily bespattering me, and that I am not willing to gratify you with. I thank God through Jesus Christ I have a full testimony in my own Conscience both touching the causes and Inducements of my present writing, *viz.* my hearty love and affection to Truth and your persons, (for whom I have long time dayly prayed God who is light, to lead you into the true light, and the acknowledgment of the Mystery which was hid from Ages and Generations:) and also touching my faithfulness and Integrity in the collections and Citations and Observations I have made: so that whoever of you have a true discerning of spirits, which you lay so great a claim to, I am sure ye must justify me in what I have done, and receive it as that which I was moved to, in the general, by the light of God and Christ in my heart. But however you receive it or judge of it, he that justifieth me is the Lord, to whom I commit my self and it, still praying for you, for I am

Your affectionate Friend.

F I N I S.

The courteous Reader may be pleased to take notice that the words relating to Scripture in the Citations out of *G. Fox*, should have been Printed in a different Character as they are in *G. F's* Book: such are these, p. 6. l.7. l.12. p.7. l.21.24. p.8. l.12. 13. 24. 25. 27. p.9. l. 15.17. *them*. l.30. p.10. l.20.29. p.11. l.25.26. p.12. l.24. p.13. l.16.27. p.14. l.21.26. *the Spirit*. l.31. 32.

E R R A T A.

Page, 7. l.31. non, *read*, not. p.11. l. 18. r. found there. p. 13. l.31, *for*, I am only to, r. It's enough that I. p.31, l.12. for, r, far, p.38. l.25. r. think.